

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 8

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Office action mailed December 15, 2005. Upon entry of the amendments in this response claims 1-35 are pending. More specifically, claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, and 33 are amended. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter.

I. Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1-6, 12-17, and 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408). Claims 7-11, 18-21, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408) in view of *Lawrence, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,780). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. Examiner Interview

Applicant first wishes to express sincere appreciation for the time that Examiners Chojnacki and Rimell spent with Applicant's representatives Jeff Kuester and Benjie Balser during a January 17, 2006, telephone discussion regarding the above-identified Office Action. Applicant believes that various features described in the patent application and recited in the claims, including a system log, were discussed during the telephone discussion, and that the outcome of this discussion is addressed herein. During that conversation, Examiner Chojnacki seemed to indicate that it would be potentially beneficial for Applicant to file this amendment and response. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner Chojnacki carefully consider this amendment and response.

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 9

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

A. Claims 1-6 and 12

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites:

1. A method for providing automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic services, comprising:

searching a database for a match between a user system log and information in the database;

obtaining keywords resulting from the searching step;

utilizing a database table to associate the keywords with potential services to sell to a customer; and

producing a set of suggested actual services and associated information regarding services that can be sold to the customer.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Burnett* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **searching a database for a match between a user system log and information in the database**. Therefore, *Burnett* does not anticipate independent claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 1 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 2-6 and 12 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-6 and 12 contain all the steps/features of

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 10

independent claim 1. *See Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002) *Jeneric/Pentron, Inc. v. Dillon Co.*, 205 F.3d 1377, 54 U.S.P.Q.2d 1086 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Wahpeton Canvas Co. v. Frontier Inc.*, 870 F.2d 1546, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, since dependent claims 2-6 and 12 are patentable over *Burnett*, the rejection to claims 2-6 and 12 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-6 and 12 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence there are other reasons why dependent claims 2-6 and 12 are allowable.

B. Claims 13-17 and 22-23

The Office Action rejects claims 13-17 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 13 as amended recites:

13. A computer-readable medium comprising:

logic configured to search a database for a match between a user system log and information in the database;

logic configured to obtain keywords resulting from the search;

logic configured to utilize a database table to associate the keywords with potential services to sell to a customer; and

logic configured to produce a set of suggested services and associated information of services that can be sold to customer.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. Applicant respectfully submits

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 11

that independent claim 13 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Burnett* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least logic configured to search a database for a match between a user system log and information in the database. Therefore, *Burnett* does not anticipate independent claim 13, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 13 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 14-17 and 22-23 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 14-17 and 22-23 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 13. Therefore, since dependent claims 14-17 and 22-23 are patentable over *Burnett*, the rejection to claims 14-17 and 22-23 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 13, dependent claims 14-17 and 22-23 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence there are other reasons why dependent claims 14-17 and 22-23 are allowable.

C. Claims 24-34

The Office Action rejects claims 24-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 24 as amended recites:

24. A system for automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic security services, comprising:

a cycler configured to search through a plurality of databases to match a user system log with sales information in the databases and to provide keywords resulting from the search; and

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 12

a service suggestion analyzer operatively coupled to the cycler, the service suggestion analyzer configured to provide a set of potential services to be sold to a customer based on the keywords from the cycler.

(Emphasis added).

For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 as amended is allowable for at least the reason that *Burnett* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least a **cycler configured to search through a plurality of databases to match a user system log with sales information in the databases and to provide keywords resulting from the search**. Therefore, *Burnett* does not anticipate independent claim 24, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Because independent claim 24 as amended is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 25-34 (which depend from independent claim 24) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 25-34 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 24. Therefore, since dependent claims 25-34 are patentable over *Burnett*, the rejection to claims 25-34 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 24, dependent claims 25-34 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence there are other reasons why dependent claims 25-34 are allowable.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Claims 7-11

The Office Action rejects claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408) in view of *Lawrence, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,780). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 13

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 7-11 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 7-11 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejection to claims 7-11 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 1, dependent claims 7-11 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence there are other reasons why dependent claims 7-11 are allowable.

Additionally, with regard to the rejection of claims 7-11, *Lawrence* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Burnett* noted above. Therefore, claims 7-11 are considered patentable over any combination of these documents.

B. Claims 18-21

The Office Action rejects claims 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408) in view of *Lawrence, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,780). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Because independent claim 13 is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 18-21 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 18-21 contain all the steps/features of independent claim 13. Therefore, the rejection to claims 18-21 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 13, dependent claims 18-21 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence there are other reasons why dependent claims 18-21 are allowable.

Additionally, with regard to the rejection of claims 18-21, *Lawrence* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Burnett* noted above. Therefore, claims 18-21 are considered patentable over any combination of these documents.

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 14

C. Claim 35

The Office Action rejects claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Burnett* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0087408) in view of *Lawrence, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,780). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Because independent claim 24 is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claim 35 (which depends from independent claim 24) is allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claim 35 contains all the steps/features of independent claim 24.

Therefore, the rejection to claim 35 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 24, dependent claim 35 recites further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claim itself, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence there are other reasons why dependent claim 35 is allowable.

Additionally, with regard to the rejection of claim 35, *Lawrence* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Burnett* noted above. Therefore, claim 35 is considered patentable over any combination of these documents.

V. Miscellaneous Issues

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

Serial No.: 10/611,630
Art Unit: 2164
Page 15

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-35 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

Customer No.: 38823